

**LIPSON, NEILSON, COLE, SELTZER & GARIN, P.C.**

9900 Covington Cross Drive, Suite 120  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89144  
Telephone: (702) 382-1500 Facsimile: (702) 382-1512

1 LIPSON, NEILSON, COLE, SELTZER & GARIN, P.C.  
2 KALEB D. ANDERSON, ESQ.  
3 NEVADA BAR No. 7582  
SIRIA L. GUTIERREZ, ESQ.  
3 NEVADA BAR No. 11981  
4 9900 Covington Cross Drive, Suite 120  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89144  
Phone: (702) 382-1500  
5 Fax: (702) 382-1512  
[kanderson@lipsonneilson.com](mailto:kanderson@lipsonneilson.com)  
[sgutierrez@lipsonneilson.com](mailto:sgutierrez@lipsonneilson.com)

7 *Attorneys for Defendant*  
8 *Siena Homeowners Association*

9  
10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
11  
12 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

13 U.S. BANK, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, AS  
14 TRUSTEE FOR THE FIRST FRANKLIN  
MORTGAGE LOAN TRUST, MORTGAGE  
ASSET BACKED CERTIFICATES, SERIES  
2007-FF1

15 Plaintiffs,

16 V.  
17 SFR INVESTMENTS POOL 1, LLC., a  
Nevada Limited Liability Company;  
18 D'ANDREA COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION, a  
Domestic Non-profit Corporation; ALESSI &  
KOENIG, LLC., a Domestic Limited Liability  
Company, SIENA HOMEOWNERS  
ASSOCIATION, a Domestic Non-Profit  
Corporation; THE CLARKSON LAW GROUP,  
P.C., a Nevada Professional Corporation,

21 Defendants.

22 CASE NO: 3:15-cv-00241-RCJ-WGC

23  
24 **MOTION TO DISMISS PURSUANT TO**  
**FRCP 12(b)(6)**

25 **I. Introduction**

26 U.S. Bank's lawsuit against Siena HOA seeks to punish it for a foreclosure sale it  
had nothing to do with and to enjoin Siena HOA from conducting a hypothetical, non-  
existent foreclosure. Simply put, as to Siena HOA, this matter is simply not ripe and U.S.  
Bank cannot state a cause for relief against Siena HOA. Therefore, Siena HOA asks to be  
dismissed from this premature action against it.

1       **II. Statement of Relevant Facts**

2              On or about June 6, 2013, D'Andrea Community Association conducted a non-  
 3              judicial foreclosure on the residence located at 2546 Napoli Drive, Sparks, Nevada 89434.  
 4              Complaint ¶ 2, 32. SFR Investment Pool 1, LLC acquired the property and recorded its  
 5              Trustee's Deed Upon Sale on June 14, 2013. Complaint ¶ 31-32. Siena HOA had nothing  
 6              to do with the foreclosure sale. See, Complaint, Exhibit 7, 8, 9, and 15. Siena HOA is a  
 7              completely separate entity to the D'Andrea Community Association, which foreclosed on  
 8              the property in 2013.

9              Nearly 15-months after the foreclosure sale, Siena HOA recorded a Notice of  
 10             Delinquent Assessment Lien on September 4, 2014. Complaint ¶ 33, Exhibit 16. Siena  
 11             HOA's lien amount as of November 3, 2014, was \$3,238.73. See, Exhibit Docket Entry No.  
 12             24-3, Notice of Default and Election to Sell Under Notice of Delinquent Assessment. There  
 13             has been no notice of foreclosure and no sale date has been set. In other words, there is  
 14             no pending foreclosure sale.

15       **III. Standard of Review**

16              A United States district court sitting in diversity jurisdiction applies the substantive  
 17              state law in which the court sits and the federal procedural law; therefore, Nevada law  
 18              governs the substantive matter and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. See *Erie R. Co.*  
 19              *v. Tompkins*, 304 U.S. 64, 78 (1938); see also *Shannon-Vail Five Inc., et al. v. Bunch, et*  
 20              *al.*, 270 F.3d 1207, 1210 (9th Cir. 2001) ("A federal district court must apply the state law  
 21              that would be applied by the state court of the state in which it sits.").

22  
 23       **A. Motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim of relief**

24              A motion to dismiss is warranted when a complaint fails "to state a claim upon which  
 25              relief can be granted." Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). A district court must consider all  
 26              allegations in the complaint in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party. *Gilligan v.*  
 27              *Jamco Dev. Corp.*, 108 F.3d 246 (9th Cir.1997). The complaint should be dismissed,  
 28              however, if it "appears beyond a doubt that it could prove no set of facts, which if true,

would entitle [the plaintiff] to relief." *Buzz Stew, LLC v. City of N. Las Vegas*, 124 Nev. 224, 228, 181 P.3d 670, 672 (2008). Plaintiffs must provide "more than mere labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do." *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 1959, 167 L.Ed. 2d 929 (2007). "Factual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level[;]" instead, a plaintiff must allege "enough facts to state a claim for relief that is plausible"- not merely "conceivable"- on its face. *Id.* at 1974. See also *Wensley v. First Nat. Bank of Nevada*, 874 F.Supp. 2d 957, 962 (D. Nev. 2012) (noting that *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 1953, 173 L.Ed. 2d 868 (2009) clarifies that *Twombly* applies to pleadings in all "civil actions").

#### **IV. US Bank has failed to state a claim because the issue is not ripe as to Siena HOA and the only purported cause of action against Siena is not a viable cause of action**

Article III requires that federal courts only hear matters where there is a controversy. "The ripeness doctrine is drawn both from Article III limitations on judicial power and from prudential reasons for refusing to exercise jurisdiction." *46 Nat'l Park Hospitality Ass'n v. Dep't of Interior*, 538 U.S. 803, 808, 123 S.Ct. 2026, 155 L.Ed.2d 1017 (2003). Indeed, the ripeness doctrine prevents federal courts from "becoming entangled in 'abstract disagreements.'" *Abbott Labs. v. Gardner*, 387 U.S. 136, 148, 87 S.Ct. 1507, 18 L.Ed.2d 681 (1967), abrogated on other grounds by *Califano v. Sanders*, 430 U.S. 99, 97 S.Ct. 980, 51 L.Ed.2d 192 (1977)). A matter is not ripe "if it rests upon contingent future events that may not occur as anticipated, or indeed may not occur at all." *Scott v. Pasadena Unified Sch. Dist.*, 306 F.3d 646, 662 (9th Cir.2002).

##### **A. This matter is not ripe and should be dismissed**

There is no dispute that Siena HOA was not a party to the non-judicial foreclosure on June 6, 2013; thus, the only cause of action listed in U.S. Bank's Complaint is an action for a preliminary injunction. U.S. Bank, however, never states what it is trying to enjoin

1 Siena HOA from doing. See, Complaint ¶ 87-95. In fact, the only party truly mentioned in  
 2 the preliminary injunction section is SFR, and there is no mention of Siena HOA.  
 3

4 Siena HOA anticipates that U.S. Bank will argue that because Siena HOA has  
 5 recorded a Notice of Delinquency that the action of recording the Notice means there is a  
 6 pending foreclosure. This argument is flawed because the only action that can give notice  
 7 of a pending foreclosure, per Nevada law, is a Notice of Sale in compliance with NRS §  
 8 116.311635. No Notice of Sale has been recorded and served in this matter.

9 Thus, this entire litigation against Siena HOA is contingent upon some potential  
 10 future event and abstract disagreement. With no pending sale, it would be fundamentally  
 11 unfair and enjoin Siena HOA from exercising its rights. In fact, it would completely stop  
 12 Siena from conducting any of the lawful activities it is allowed to conduct in Nevada. If this  
 13 Court allows U.S. Bank to enjoin Siena HOA, despite the record that Siena HOA has done  
 14 nothing to harm any party it would empower the banks to seek to enjoin HOAs throughout  
 15 Nevada simply for exercising their rights. The chilling effects would cause HOAs to  
 16 abandon their rights for fear of unnecessary litigation simply for attempting to comply with  
 17 the statutory requirements. The Court cannot allow this to occur and should dismiss this  
 18 premature action.

**B. An injunction is not a cause of action**

19 Fed. R. Civ. P. 65. governs injunctions. Plaintiffs bear the burden of establishing by  
 20 motion that it will suffer immediate and irreparable harm, meaning “money damages alone  
 21 will not suffice to restore the moving party to its rightful position.” *Clark Pacific v. Krump*  
*Constr., Inc.*, 942 F.Supp. 1324, 1346 (D.Nev.1996). To obtain the injunction a plaintiff  
 22 must show: (1) the suffering of irreparable harm if injunctive relief is not granted; (2)  
 23 success on the merits; (3) the balance of equities tips in favor of the moving party; and (4)  
 24 granting the injunction is in the public interest. See *Stanley v. University of Southern*  
*California*, 13 F.3d 1313, 1319 (9th Cir.1994).

25           ///

Here, there is no need to even address the injunction factors because U.S. Bank cannot show that it will suffer immediate and irreparable harm. This is because Siena HOA has not filed and served a Notice of Sale. There is nothing immediate about a potential, speculative, and remote foreclosure at some undefined time in the future. If this Court were to entertain U.S. Bank's request to enjoin Siena HOA from conducting some speculative event it would necessarily "becom[e] entangled in 'abstract disagreements.'" *Abbott Labs.*, 387 U.S. at 148.

## **V. Conclusion**

To sum up, Siena HOA does not have a pending foreclosure sale. Siena HOA had nothing to do with the June 2013 foreclosure. As a result, this lawsuit is completely premature as to Siena HOA as it has no place in this litigation and following statutory requirements is not a basis for a lawsuit. Thus, U.S. Bank has failed to state a claim against Siena HOA and it should be dismissed from this action in total and for any sanctions this Court deems appropriate.

DATED this 10<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2015.

LIPSON, NEILSON, COLE, SELTZER, GARIN, P.C.

By: /s/ Kaleb D. Anderson  
KALEB D. ANDERSON.  
NEVADA BAR No. 7582  
SIRIA L. GUTIERREZ, ESQ.  
NEVADA BAR No. 11981  
9900 Covington Cross Drive, Suite 120  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89144

*Attorneys for Defendant  
Siena Homeowners Association*

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2015, service of the foregoing  
**MOTION TO DISMISS PURSUANT TO FRCP 12(b)(6)** was made pursuant to FRCP 5(b)  
and electronically transmitted to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF system for filing and  
transmittal to all interested parties.

Dana Jonathon Nitz, Esq.  
Natalie C. Lehman, Esq.  
WRIGHT, FINLAY, & ZAK, LLP.  
7785 W. Sahara Ave., Suite 200  
Las Vegas, NV 89117  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff U.S. Bank National Association*

Howard C. Kim, Esq.  
Diana S. Cline, Esq.  
Jacqueline A. Gilbert, Esq.  
**HOWARD KIM & ASSOCIATES**  
1055 Whitney Ranch Drive, Suite 110  
Henderson, NV 89014  
*Attorneys for SFR Investments Pool 1, LLC.*

Adam H. Clarkson, Esq.  
James B. Fairbanks, Esq.  
Matthew J. McAlonis, Esq.  
THE CLARKSON LAW GROUP, P.C.  
2300 W. Sahara Ave., Suite 950  
Las Vegas, NV 89102  
*Attorneys for Defendant The Clarkson Law Group, P.C.*

/s/ Talin Ebrahimian  
An Employee of  
LIPSON, NEILSON, COLE, SELTZER, GARIN, P.C.